

From: [Alastair Pike](#)
To: [Paul Whitaker](#)
Subject: RE: Penwortham
Date: 24 August 2022 11:45:00
Attachments: [215827A-Bee Lane Preston-Risk Assessment-V2.pdf](#)
[215827A-Bee Lane Preston-Risk Assessment-V2.xlsx](#)

Hi Paul, doing well thanks same to you.

Thanks for the email and my apologies if this wasn't clear,

I confirm that the purpose of my appointment was to provide a Risk Assessment of Bee Lane Bridge, in the context of the proposed development and on the basis of both its existing layout, and a revised layout as set out in drawing VN211918-D105-A Bee Lane Site Access.

To gain an understanding of the situation you and I had a number of discussions and I was provided with:

1. Drawing VN211918-D105-A Bee Lane Site Access
2. The Stage 1 RSA for Bee Lane dated November 2021 report reference 261121_J190016_Bee Lane
3. The TA dated July 2021
4. An indication of the likely change in demand for movement
5. Comments on the development application from Network Rail
6. Road Safety Audit Designers Response

In addition, I corresponded with the RSA auditor specifically in respect of the bridge. As the RSA does not raise any issues in respect of the bridge, I asked via email *"has the bridge been assessed as a shared space on the Bee Lane priority access. Have pedestrians and cyclists been taken into account using this route as part of the RSA. I presume the answer to this is yes but just wanted to check as there were no issues raised"*

The answer from the auditor was *"the bridge was assumed to be shared use (as currently is). No issues were raised at the bridge"*

In light of that, and based on my site visit and consideration my view was that there were no issues with respect of the bridge, which I understand to be consistent with the safety auditor's view. My risk assessment documentation focussed on reporting the change in risk as a result of the interventions made in response to the auditors comments.

However, whilst you and I have spoken with regards to the degree of risk on the bridge, I appreciate that this may not have been clear in the documentation that I provided.

Therefore, for clarity, my assessment of risk for either the shared space option or the D105A option at the bridge is that there is no issue, or low risk. If it helps, I have added this clarity to my risk assessment matrix, and in particular addressing the comment made by Network Rail. This is attached.

I hope this is helpful Paul but please don't hesitate to contact me if there is anything further you wish to discuss.

Kind regards

Alastair

From: Paul Whitaker <Paul.Whitaker@vectos.co.uk>

Sent: 19 August 2022 11:14

To: Alastair Pike <Alastair.Pike@vectos.co.uk>

Subject: Penwortham

Morning Alistair, hope you're well.

I'm emailing regarding the Risk Assessment that we commissioned you to undertake in respect of the Bee Lane bridge.

Mike has asked for clarification that you did consider the Bee Lane bridge, and in what way, as this is not spelt out in your final document dated 12th May 2022.

Please note that this email train, or the information within it, may be used at the forthcoming Penwortham Inquiry to provide clarity to the Inspector on the information that you had when making your judgement, and the basis on which you made your judgement.

Happy to discuss should you have any queries.

Many thanks

Paul

Risk Assessment Matrix

Task:	ROAD SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT		
Assessment Ref:	215827A - The Lanes, Penwortham	Date of Assessment:	12/05/2022 / updated on 19/08/2022
Date of Issue:	12/05/2022 / updated on 19/08/2022		
Location:	Bee Lane Priority Access Junction (including bridge)		
Name of Assessor:	Alastair Pike	Date:	12/05/2022 / updated on 19/08/2022
Job Title:	Head of Road Safety		
Contact Email:	alastair.pike@vectos.co.uk	Telephone Number:	029 2072 0860

Estimated Level of Risk (Based on Risk Rating) – (R)		
Low Risk (1-9)	Ensure assumed control measures are maintained and reviewed, as necessary.	Acceptable
Medium Risk (10-19)	Additional control measures needed to reduce risk rating to a level which is equivalent to a test of “reasonably required” for the population concerned.	Tolerable
High Risk (20-25)	Activity not permitted. Hazard to be avoided or risk to be reduced to a tolerable level.	Unacceptable

Risk Rating will apply to both likelihood and severity and then multiplied together to give actual Risk Rating of a particular hazard.

Location:	Bee Lane - Priority Access Junction (Including Bridge)
Date:	12/05/2022 / updated on 19/08/2022

Severity of Outcome – (S)	Rating Given	Likelihood – (L)	Rating Given
Minor Harm: Minor damage or loss no injury.	1	Very Unlikely	1
Moderate Harm: Slight injury or illness, moderate damage or loss.	2	Unlikely	2
Serious Harm: Serious injury or illness, substantial damage or loss.	3	May Happen	3
Major Harm: Fatal injury, major damage or loss.	4	Likely	4
Extreme Harm: Multiple fatalities extreme loss or damage.	5	Almost Certain	5

Rating will apply to both likelihood and severity multiplied to give hazard risk rating

Hazard	Risk	S	L	R	Control Measures	S	L	R	Further Action Required	By Whom
RSAS1 Problem 1. Proposed uncontrolled crossing at the priority controlled site access junction are set too far into the minor arm.	Location of the proposed uncontrolled crossing facility may lead to collisions between pedestrians and oncoming traffic due to reduced visibility.	3	3	9	Relocate uncontrolled crossing closer to Bee Lane and ensure that the required visibility is achieved between vehicles and pedestrians. See attached plan D105A and overview D111.	3	2	6	Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)	Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team
RSAS1 Problem 2. Proposed footway to the east of the proposed junction protrudes into existing carriageway with substandard existing onward provision.	Pedestrians exposed to collisions with vehicular traffic at the point where the proposed scheme meets the existing footway on the southern side of Bee Lane.	3	3	9	Amend the design to remove NMU provisions to the east of the junction on the southern side of Bee Lane. Provide a crossing facility from the proposed junction to the north of Bee Lane. Provide a pedestrian route to tie into the existing facility to the east.	3	2	6	Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)	Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team
RSAS1 Problem 3. Swept path of refuse vehicle overruns opposing carriageway lane of the proposed access junction.	Potential for collisions between vehicles due to visibility between accessing and egressing vehicles.	3	3	9	The low frequency of refuse collections reduces the likelihood of a collision occurring. Overrunning of lanes by large vehicles is not an uncommon occurrence. The appropriate junction visibility must be provided.	3	2	6	Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)	Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team
RSAS1 Problem 4. Proposed northern kerb is misaligned with existing field access and may be overrun.	Vehicles egressing the field to the north of the side turning right may strike the kerb leading to loss of control type collisions.	2	2	4	None Required	2	2	4	Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)	Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team

Non motorised user interactions with vehicular traffic on the bridge.	Potential for conflict between users may lead to collisions between vehicular traffic and non motorised users. It is accepted that these interactions take place at present within a low speed / lightly trafficked environment.	2	3	6	Provide means of low level 'soft" vertical separation between non motorised users and vehicular traffic	2	2	4	Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)	Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

<p>Unprotected bridge parapet may be damaged as a result of strikes from vehicular traffic.</p>	<p>Risk of errant vehicles striking bridge parapets leading to damage. It should be noted that there were no recorded instances of this having occurred during the 5 year collision history.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Provide means of low level 'soft' vertical separation between bridge infrastructure and vehicular traffic</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Proposed highway amendments to be subject to Stages 2 – 3 Road Safety Audit to GG119 Standards. (Stage 1 RSA Already undertaken for proposed site access junction)</p>	<p>Local Authority and Road Safety Audit Team</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------